



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ml

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,548	07/17/2003	Fathi Debili	28944/39534	1326

4743 7590 03/28/2007
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300
SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

MCFADDEN, SUSAN IRIS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-30 are objected to because of the following informalities: the language reads roughly. It is unclear what is meant by "vowelized" and "unvowelized".
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1,11, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Voyellation automatique de l'arabe", (Debili et al, cited by Applicant).

In regard to claims 1,11, and 21, Debili et al. show a system, method, and computer readable medium for the vowelization of a language text, aided by computer means, wherein: a) a first memory area is provided, in which a first dictionary comprising unvowelized words is stored, b) a second memory area is provided, in which a second dictionary comprising groups of at least one vowelized word is stored, each group being stored in correspondence with an unvowelized word of said first dictionary, c) for a current unvowelized word, a string of characters forming at least said current

Art Unit: 2626

word is compared with strings of characters stored in the first memory area, so as to isolate at least one word from the first dictionary comprising the same character string as the current word, and d) a group of vowelized candidate words corresponding to said isolated word from the first dictionary is extracted from the second dictionary (Abstract).

5. Claims 1-6,9,11-18, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeWick, Sr et al. (4,858,170, cited by Applicant).

In regard to claims 1,11, and 21, DeWick, Sr et al. show a system, method, and computer readable medium for the vowelization of a language text, aided by computer means, wherein: a) a first memory area is provided, in which a first dictionary comprising unvowelized words is stored, b) a second memory area is provided, in which a second dictionary comprising groups of at least one vowelized word is stored, each group being stored in correspondence with an unvowelized word of said first dictionary, c) for a current unvowelized word, a string of characters forming at least said current word is compared with strings of characters stored in the first memory area, so as to isolate at least one word from the first dictionary comprising the same character string as the current word, and d) a group of vowelized candidate words corresponding to said isolated word from the first dictionary is extracted from the second dictionary (col. 5-6; Fig. 4).

In regard to claims 2, 13, and 23, DeWick, Sr et al. show that there is provided a computer routine suitable for performing said comparison of the character strings and said extraction of the group of candidate words (col. 6, Fig. 4, word separation routine).

Art Unit: 2626

In regard to claims 3,12, and 22, DeWick, Sr et al. show that there is provided a man/machine interface suitable for offering a user a list of choices of said candidate words (col. 6, ln 1-10, displayed on the computer, Fig. 1, item 11).

In regard to claims 4-6,14-17, and 24, DeWick, Sr et al. show the system and method above, wherein said current word forming part of a succession of words, a string of characters forming said succession of words comprising the current word is compared with strings of characters stored in a memory area in correspondence with the second memory area, so as to identify a plurality of words comprising one and the same string of characters as said succession of words, and for said current word, at least one vowelized word is selected from said group of vowelized candidate words as a function of the succession of identified words and of a position of the current word in said succession of identified words (Fig. 4, matching input word), which inherently can be a complete sentence defined by a string of characters between two punctuation characters (transcripts contain complete sentences (col. 7, ln 14-34), and inherently automatically replaced in an electronically edited text with said vowelized word, selected from the group of candidate words (col. 7).

In regard to claims 9 and 18, DeWick, Sr et al. show that said current word forming part of a current succession of words, following the choice of a word by said user from the list of candidate words, the chosen word is stored with the succession of words, in a memory area in correspondence with said second memory area (libraries, Fig. 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7-8,10,19,20,25-29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeWick, Sr et al. in view of Bennett et al. (5815639).

In regard to claims 7-8,10,19,20,27-29, and 30, DeWick, Sr et al. show the system and method discussed above. They do not specifically show that the man/machine interface offers a user a list of choices comprising words selected from said candidate words, wherein grammatical labels are furthermore stored in correspondence with each word in each group of the second dictionary, and wherein the man/machine interface furthermore indicates to the user a grammatical label of each of the words selected from said candidate words. Bennett et al. shows a transcription system that includes a user selection feature with grammatical labels in Figure 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to add these features because they make the system more user-friendly.

In regard to claims 25-26, DeWick, Sr et al. and Bennett et al. show the system and method discussed above. They do not specifically show the computer program is compatible with an Arabic language editing program. The Examiner takes Official Notice that Arabic dictionaries and translations are well known in the art. Therefore, it would


Art Unit: 2626

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to add this feature it makes the system more specialized.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan McFadden whose telephone number is 571-272-7621. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Susan McFadden
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2626

March 23, 2007